



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,762	01/14/2000	Bahram Ghaffarzadeh Kermani	Kermani 35	8802
7590	08/15/2007		EXAMINER	
Theodore Naccarella			OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N	
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP				
2600 Aramark Tower			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1101 Market Street			2626	
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/483,762	KERMANI, BAHRAM GHAFFARZADEH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael N. Opsasnick	2626

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-39.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE


8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

**MICHAEL OPSASNICK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Michael N Opsasnick
AU2626

8/14/07

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: as per applicants arguments to improper hindsight, examiner argues that Ladden is teaching that the codecs do no optimally code speech for use in speech recognition, and to remedy this, is to shift the recognition into a localized device; furthermore, one can argue that applicant's gleaned their motivation to perform this operation from the Ladden reference, since the Ladden reference has an earlier filing date than applicant's disclosure. As per applicants arguments against non-analogous art, examiner notes, as noted by applicant, that Ladden is concerned with switching between algorithms that improve speech recognition - Kimura is also concerned with improving speech recognition, including concern regarding processing power and speed (col. 1 and 2). As per applicants argument against Ladden, examiner argues that Ladden teaches parameters to the local device from a remote device because it would advantageously use a more powerful speech recognition algorithm located at the base/local station rather than a less than ideal codec that is located at the wireless device (Ladden et al (5855003), col. 1 lines 12-20). As per the remaining arguments filed, examiner argues that Kimura teaches stored standard pattern data for speech recognition for voice commands, the combination of Kimura in view of Ladden teaches the claim limitations (Ladden teaches the location, Kimura teaches the recorder operation), Kiura entire disclosure is about a remote control that has button including recording commands (i.e., a remote control with buttons), and examiner notes that if "Kimura did not teach a control device", then how would a remote control function as a controller?

MICHAEL OPSASNICK

PRIMARY EXAMINER



Michael N Opsasnick
AU2626

8/14/07